## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

SCOTT BRIAN ST	TEFFLER,	)		
٧.	Plaintiff,	) ) )	Civil No.	03-1491-CO
JEAN HILL,		) )	ORDER	
	Defendant.	) ) )		

Magistrate Judge John P. Cooney filed Findings and Recommendation on March 31, 2005, in the above entitled case. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the magistrate judge's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Plaintiff has timely filed objections. I have, therefore, given de novo review of Magistrate Judge Cooney's rulings.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Cooney's Findings and Recommendation filed March 31, 2005, in its entirety. Defendant's motion for summary judgment (#51) is allowed. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (#25) denied. This action is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 1255 day of

2005.